

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 12-13 and 15 as being anticipated by Published Application 2002/0039328 (hereafter Dubinsky). To more particularly point out one embodiment of the invention, Applicants have canceled claim 5 and amended claims 1 and 20 to include the following limitations from claim 5: a slip comprising a production pipe engaging surface and a wedge comprising a tapered surface in sliding contact with the slip, whereby the wedge forces the slip into engagement with the production pipe as the wedge slides relative to the slip. The Examiner has indicated that claim 5 is allowable subject matter; therefore, the limitations distinguish the claim over Dubinsky. Claims 4, 12-13 and 15 depend from claim 1 and merely add additional elements. Thus Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 4, 12-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn and the claims formally allowed at this time.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 2-3, 7, 11, 14, 16-18 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dubinsky. Examiner has failed to provide a prima facie basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because the references do not disclose all the limitations of the claimed invention.

With respect to claims 2-3, 7, 11, 14, 16 and 20-27, Applicants respectfully submit that the references do not disclose a slip comprising a production pipe engaging surface and a wedge comprising a tapered surface in sliding contact with the slip, whereby the wedge forces the slip into engagement with the production pipe as the wedge slides relative to the slip. Examiner has indicated that this is allowable subject matter. With respect to claims 17 and 18, Dubinsky

does not disclose a SCADA box acoustically coupled to the pipe. Examiner argues that Dubinsky teaches a sensor, which is equivalent to a SCADA. Applicants respectfully disagrees. SCADA is the acronym for *Supervisory Control And Data Acquisition*. The term refers to a large-scale, distributed measurement (and control) system; therefore a sensor is not equivalent to a SCADA box. For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-3, 7, 11, 14, 16-18 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims formally allowed at this time.

Allowable Subject Matter

Examiner has indicated that claims 5-6, 8-10 and 19 are objected to for being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in dependent form. Applicant thanks Examiner for indicating the allowability of these claims.

Conclusion

Applicants have addressed each and every objection and ground for rejection. The amended claims are patentable over the cited art and Applicants request that the application be allowed. In the event the Examiner has any questions or there are any issues with respect to the application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number below prior to the issuance of any written action.

Respectfully submitted,
John Stewart et al.

By: /Rachael Stiegel/
Patent Agent, Rachael Stiegel
Registration No. 54,469
(713) 241-1842

P.O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463